

PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

Everyman '67

WMAQ-TV

April 9, 1967 - 9:30 AM

Chicago

CHURCHMEN DISCUSS C.I.A. INVOLVEMENT IN PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

BEN RICHARDSON: "Good morning. I'm Ben Richardson with Herb Davis for the Church Federation of Greater Chicago. And this is Everyman '67. Our subject today is the Central Intelligence Agency, or the C.I.A. as it is properly (sic) known.

"Recently the U.S.' entry into the international spy race made headlines when it was discovered that our agency had bought its way into many private organizations. Americans were at first shocked, disillusioned, and finally uncomfortable to think that the fellow in the next house or office, or even church pew, might be acting in behalf of the C.I.A.. Somehow it didn't seem fair. Those romantic secret spy adventures were supposed to take place in foreign lands while our democracy cleansed itself by means of public debate and open exchange of ideas.

"Why should Americans be under the scrutiny of such a powerful secret organization? But on the other hand, why not? Doesn't our form of government need protection at home as well as abroad? And shouldn't our spy work be pervasive enough to work effectively. But even if protection is necessary, can a democracy allow a secret organization to do the job?

"These are some of the questions. Today we are going to present some of the reactions to them which have come from the Church. We'll begin with some ideas from the world of religious journalism, and here is Al Klauser(?) of the Associated Chicago Press in Chicago (sic). Al."

KLAUSER: "Be very glad to report on it. As you can well imagine, there's been quite a flap, at least throughout the Protestant press on the C.I.A. and the funds that it gave, or allegedly gave, and almost all of the denominational -- denominational publications had something to say, mostly of a negative nature, that is to say, critical nature of the C.I.A.'s actions in these matters.

"This morning I thought I would just report, Ben, on the three publications which, in one sense of the term, are not tied with any specific denomination in our country. And I want to take comments that appeared in Christianity Today, in the Christian Century, and

Christianity in Crisis.

"First I'd like to give the report or the comments that appeared in Christianity Today. They titled their editorial 'Educational Integrity and the C.I.A.' Now this may perhaps reveal some of the leanings of the staff of Christianity Today. They said that many of the critics of the C.I.A. are the same type of critics who are always critical of the House Unamerican Activities Committee, and they said that they are a little bit disturbed over the fact that those who are criticizing the C.I.A. are those who are always identified with left-wing views. However, at the same time the magazine points out very exactly and concisely that we're not happy about the use of government funds on campuses to promote specific ideological goals. And they conclude their editorial comment by saying the most important aspect of the issue of integrity in American education runs deeper than the C.I.A. controversy. And they say that we should be extremely careful on how the funds of the C.I.A. are parcelled out to educational groups.

"Then I switch over to the Christian Century. The Christian Century takes somewhat of a semi-humorous attitude or point of view on it, and calls their lead -- one of their lead editorials 'The C.I.A. Caper.' And it points out the fact that the C.I.A. has thrown a sort of a pall over all types of activity and very especially over the N.S.A.. And while it is a sort of a semi-humorous approach, nevertheless there's sort of a feeling of anguish in the part of the editor of the Christian Century that there are so many people involved in these subsidies, that are being given to all types of groups including the National Council of Churches. And it ends up this editorial by saying that total corruption has set in. Now I don't know whether or not there's a sort of a tongue-in-cheek attitude when it sets this, but the Century points out we are so poor that even our typewriter ribbon is faded and we haven't gotten any money from the C.I.A.. We're absolutely sure we're absolutely clean, and then it ends, 'We think we are clean.'"

RICHARDSON: "Thank you, Al, I imagine that'll be kind of a conclusion a number of agencies will come to."

KLAUSER: "I'll refer later on to the Christianity in Crisis."

RICHARDSON: "Very well, fine. Now, to Herb with our studio guests for further discussion, of the C.I.A. Herb."

DAVIS: "Thank you, Ben. We have with us this morning Doctor Tyler Thompson, professor of Philosophy of Religion at Garret(?) Theological Seminary, and a former candidate for Congress in the 13th District. Also Mr. Bernard O. Brown, minister for the international students at the University of Chicago.

"There's no question in my mind that we may need a spy organization. I'm wondering, though, why was it necessary in this so-called democratic society that the C.I.A. had to be involved in financing and possibly manipulating the opinions and ideas of student organizations

labor, even church groups."

THOMPSON: "Well the question of whether it's necessary is a very controversial question, and I won't try to settle that immediately. First, I think we ought to try to Understand why it was done. If it's decided that some objective is desirable such as increasing the American representation in various international student or labor conferences, and decided that the government ought to try to help stimulate this, but that if it's known that the government is doing this it will -- it will have detrimental effects, then you're going to look for some secret means of doing it. And the C.I.A. is the..."

DAVIS: "Well why would it be detrimental to know that the government was paying the expenses of students to an international meeting?"

THOMPSON: "Well I think fundamentally some element of deceit here is -- is the case. Often a cause will be damaged or less -- get less popular acceptance if it is -- if it's some-- if it can be connected with the government, because people are suspicious of government and have a -- a....

DAVIS: "Well isn't this true that we always accuse the Communists of this?"

THOMPSON: "Yes."

BROWN: "Actually the first time that -- that the N.S.A. assumed prominence in international student politics was when it attempted to form another coalition of student -- national student unions, because of a -- an original formulation of student government -- ah -- groups, in Vienna, where it was clear that certain of the Communist nations were being sponsored by their gov -- the student groups were being sponsored by their governments. And the N.S.A. represented at that time a position that, well, we ought to be able to get student leaders, student representatives together, student unions should be able to be formulated that do not represent a government's point of view but that can represent students itself, student groups themselves on their own campuses and the kind of thought, the kind of action that was typical there. So that now that the revelation has come forward you see that in all of this time when presumably the National Student Association was acting to create an open forum of non-governmental sponsored student organizations, we find that this hasn't been true at all."

DAVIS: "I see. I wonder, Ben, how do you feel about the necessity of the C.I.A. to sponsor such things?"

RICHARDSON: "Well, Herb, I take a little broader term than the C.I.A.. I think the nature of perpetuating an ideology in a given country requires this kind of thing. And I think you'll find it in school systems, where they're perpetuating a certain point of view through textbooks; you'll find it in the public utilities, where they have their own local C.I.A., so to speak; you'll find it in churches, where they're the same sort of a technique to

perpetuate a given theological position so that I'm not disturbed that this takes place, nor do I think the C.I.A. is the only element for this kind of a thing in our nation's government. It's a part of the character of government which wants to preserve its ideology and it's necessary to propagate it. So I don't think those who worry are naive, necessarily, but I'm not worried, because I think that sufficient sophistication prevents anxiety over the issue."

DAVIS: "Well we're coming to another type of problem, because of the disclosures of the C.I.A., whether it's natural or not, as Ben might say. How has this affected our integrity throughout the world? Though we make the claim that we are a free and open society, and that we would assume our students, our labor unions, would be molding and presenting a position that was authentic. Now how does this affect our Peace Corps people, our missionaries, other government agencies, or just people visiting throughout the world?"

THOMPSON: "Will there's a distinction that ought to be made here between integrity and reputation for integrity. These disclosures have undoubtedly shaken our reputation for integrity, and it's going to be hard to make up the ground that is -- is lost as a consequence. I've -- I believe myself that -- that the N.S.A., for example, has not been led around by the nose by the fact that it's received government subsidies, that their independence of thought has been broken down and that they've simply parroted a line that someone else has told them to parrot. Not at all. But the suspicion that this may be the case is now raised, and we have a problem on our hands in terms of world public relations."

DAVIS: "How's this happening in the student movement?"

BROWN: "Well I think if we realize, for example, that there are more than 90,000 exchange foreign scholars on our campuses in the United States today, presumably coming here with the intention and promise of participating in a kind of free and open university, including in many places the built-in structure that they participate in student government.

"For example, Indiana University has foreign student participation -- foreign student representation directly in the student government. The idea that they are therefore participating in a free and open society seems to me is -- is very seriously challenged by a situation where they find that they may indeed be under scrupulous attention of agents or people who have C.I.A. intentions in finding out what they can about them. And I don't think this experience is going to be entered into as openly and as freely and with much belief on the part of many foreign scholars in the United States.

"I think the question that Dr. Thompson was raising about overseas participation of foreign -- of -- of our -- of our American students with foreign scholars is -- is another kind of a question in some way. Because I think that already there is a large amount of mistrust abroad, that people who are abroad for various reasons are actually not in a sense representing something other than they're attending to represent. And I think this has only increased this

distrust quite a bit."

DAVIS: "I'd like to raise, in closing here, something that seems to be important to me. The CIA, of course, financed basically those groups that were either center or left-of-center politically in our country. Is there a sense in which the C.I.A. holds a political philosophy, or ideology, that is no longer in tune with the emerging younger generations of students, the people under 35? Are they attempting through their financing of organizations to continue to hold onto something that may be passing?"

BROWN: "I think that's true. I'm sure you can find people who disagree, but I think that the student activists, the people who are raising the serious moral and political questions all over on the campuses are persons for whom certain values such as openness, lack of deceit, integrity, lack of hypocrisy, are the key values they honor. And that a way of operating in this kind of subterranean power type world is -- is very distasteful and they would certainly look down upon it."

THOMPSON: "You -- you raise -- you raise a very serious question that is broader than anything we've discussed yet. The question as to whether the C.I.A. is simply an instrument of the executive branch of government, or whether it has some internal dynamism which affects and influences policy. This is a very serious and disturbing question, and I don't think that -- that we're going to get over a protest and -- and disturb -- disturbed minds on this question for a long time to come. Of course, this was raised before this present flap about the C.I.A. came up, in respect to Cuba."

DAVIS: "Recently when the attempt even to broaden these powers that would hold reign over the C.I.A. in the Senate, this was totally destroyed. There was no opportunity to open it up so other people could know what was going on and help direct its policy."

THOMPSON: "Well this is why, in this particular instance even if the -- if the objectives that the C.I.A. was trying to accomplish through these programs that we've been discussing this morning were all legitimate ones which ought to be accomplished, it now seems obvious that it was unwise to try to accomplish them through the use of the C.I.A., the very link with the idea of spying is so stimulating to the imagination that it has a very detrimental effect upon -- and aroused very deep suspicions of anything with the C.I.A. under..."

DAVIS: "...to say that they were spying upon a group, not just financially."

BROWN: "And I think this is in answer to the question the gentleman raised over -- or the comment the gentleman raised over there that after all everybody has their own position that they have to promote the best way they can. The difference here is we have the power of a government promoting position, the power that is moreover operating in a secretive way, and that this can hardly,

it seems to me, be a -- a way -- a good rule for conducting the kind of ideological sponsorship that all of us, of course, are involved in doing in our various interests."

DAVIS: "I'm sure we'll be debating this question for many, many months to come. It's hopeful that there are these signs of some change, but that -- not to destroy the possibility of international spy system, but to maintain the real possibility of structures in our nation that are open, that develop Democratic processes here should be thought out in -- in the public."

* * *

RICHARDSON: "Al, did you want to press on with something you had earlier to say?"

KLAUSER: "Ben, I'm -- I'm somewhat surprised that you -- you almost adopted a Machiavellian tone there before in defending the actions of the C.I.A., and I'd just like to point out when you cut me off there, Christianity in Crisis and what Doctor Reinhold Niebor(?), one of the editors of this journal of opinion has said, he says that this type of activity by the C.I.A. might become very dangerous because it justifies dishonesty. And he says in a free democratic society, as he points out in his lead editorial, 'Politics, Patriotism and Integrity,' we've got to be very, very careful in this matter and not attempt the type of rationalization that you were doing there, Ben."

RICHARDSON: "Well, I think we should attempt the type of rationalization I was doing, because I'm -- I don't know about Machiavellian, and the tone would have to have a slight Latin intonation to be Machiavellian, but I'd say this. I'm too sophisticated not to believe that Christianity in Crisis hasn't got its own, built-in theological E.I.A. And if I sent an article to them which they felt wasn't germane to their over-all position, it wouldn't get in any more than, you know, something getting into Stars and Stripes that the military feels is not..."

KLAUSER: "Well Ben, you're pleading a special cause here. Now when Doctor Niebor says that the so-called democracies make the corruption of truth by power an official doctrine, then obviously the combination of patriotism and the doctrine that a higher authority has the undisputed right to determine policies of national interest is as potent a political influence there as in a more totalitarian communist society."

RICHARDSON: "I'll get to Herb. But my problem with Doctor Niebor is legibility and understanding. Who knows what he's talking about, except that I know Union..."

KLAUSER: "Your conscience is bothering you here."

RICHARDSON: "I'm sure it is. But you know what bothers me more is the fact that Union Theological Seminary has a position and a built-in C.I.A., I suspect."

KLAUSER: "I'm merely reporting, Ben, I'm not defending Union Theological -- I'm merely reporting here and trying to show the fallacies in some of your statements here this morning."

RICHARDSON: "I wasn't reporting, I was editorializing, and maybe Herb can give his editorial at this point."

DAVIS: "Well I think the basic concern here is that in a society that we have now, who determines national interest? Does someone decide that there is a consensus, that our national interest is basically to defeat communism? To maintain control over certain student organizations, and maybe deny some of their freedoms, and -- and some of the reports, you know, say that these fellows that were involved could not get out any easier than I could get out of the Mafia if I joined it. What is, you know, the national interest -- interest? And is the C.I.A., in a way, setting policy which they determine is national interest?"

KLAUSER: "Well let's get in the Christian point of view, too, if you don't mind. I think when we start exalting patriotism in an uncritical obedience to the monarch here in this country, we're running into extremely dangerous waters here."

RICHARDSON: "But most of your monarchs are peculiarly Christians. You know, Congress is shot through with symbolisms, of God and Trust on the coin, and written up, you know, so that we're dealing with the same thing over and over. The men who are C.I.A.'ing it, are Christians."

KLAUSER: "All right, may I have one quotation here from Doctor Niebor, who quotes King Frederick the Great, said, 'If I did for myself what I do for my country, what a scoundrel I would be.'"

DAVIS: "This is the question, that maybe some of the folks in power do not understand the difference between moral -- social moral responsibility and individual moral responsibility."

RICHARDSON: "And national moral responsibility. The thing that I -- that I find most painful is the naivete in the presumption that this kind of a thing is not the nature of government."

KLAUSER: "Well government has to protect itself, Ben. Obviously spying is justified."

DAVIS: "There's no question about that, but who? And we're not arguing about that. But in an open society, then, are we saying that government has the right to control the public opinion polls that come out of these organizations."

RICHARDSON: "Thank you. Let me close on that, only because our time is exhausted. And we thank you, certainly, Al, for your position, and we thank the guests who've been with us."